CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 38, No 6. *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* June, 1987.

FORTRESS FALKLANDS - THE CASE AGAINST U.N. TRUSTEESHIP

by MARIE ENDEAN

"In time of peace they might be of great consequence to the nation and in time of war would make us masters of those seas."[1]

Commodore (later Admiral) Anson, 1740

ON June 14, 1982, General Menendez surrendered to Major-General Jeremy Moore. The Argentinian invasion of the Islands was over, but the international battle for the Falklands continued - and continues - in the United Nations arena.

Only four months after the war was over, a Latin American resolution in the General Assembly called for a resumption of negotiations on sovereignty over the Falklands on the grounds that the problem was one of decolonisation and not a question of self-determination. Weasel words to shift the status of the Islanders into the grip of the UN Decolonisation Committee. The Latin American lobby had already chosen Communist Cuba to chair this committee. So far so bad, but at least the danger of Communist influence being brought to bear was plain for all to see. Fortunately, the resolution was lost, but subsequent annual resolutions have seen the gradual isolation of Britain in the General Assembly.

So, the danger of UN interference in the affairs of the Falkland Islanders lurks on in the proposal, widely and frequently canvassed by "world opinion", that UN Trusteeship would solve the problem, either temporarily or permanently. Just one day after the ceasefire, Michael Foot raised the issue in a debate in the House of Commons. Mrs. Thatcher's reply was unequivocal. British servicemen had not died in order to make the Falklands a United Nations Trusteeship. "They risked their lives to defend British sovereign territory, the British way of life and the right of British people to determine their own future."[2]

A stepping-stone to Argentinian sovereignty

Nevertheless, ever since, the Trusteeship solution has strongly appealed to the Labour Party. In 1986 an internal Labour Party report returned to the attack advocating the re-opening of talks on sovereignty to find a solution acceptable to both the UK and Argentinian governments. One of the options offered was UN Trusteeship. Current Labour policy confirms that Trusteeship could be temporary or permanent. "If this Labour Party report becomes official policy of a future Labour Government, we can say goodbye to the Falklands," said Sir Rex Hunt.[3] It would be a short stepping-stone to the Argentinians gaining full sovereignty eventually.[4]

Flexible as ever, the SDP-Liberal Alliance policy-makers are also prepared to consider the options of vesting sovereignty over the Falklands initially in the United Nations. At their four-day conference at Buxton in Derbyshire in 1984, this was envisaged as likely to lead to a "stable" settlement in the South Atlantic. Delegates

overwhelmingly condemned Britain's "negative" attitude as endangering the fragile bloom of democracy in Argentina. Undoubtedly, if chosen, the Trusteeship option would breach Fortress Falklands and let in the Argentinians.

Powers wielded by the UN Secretariat

But in the process who else would be let in? Not only have the British people the right to know, but every member of NATO whose exposed flanks extend as far south as Antarctica.

The post of Secretary-General of UNO has always been in the limelight. Most students of world affairs have at least heard of Trygve Lie, Dag Hammarskjold, U Thant and Kurt Waldheim. Who was the one killed in that air crash? Who indulged in all those alleged UN orgies? Which one has been accused of Nazi atrocities? The present one is nicer, isn't he, though his name is peculiar.

But what of the holders of the equally important post of Under Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs? This department is one of the largest in the UN Secretariat. It works permanently with the Security Council on all problems involving international peace.[5] When any member of the Security Council or of the Military Staff Committee needs any special data, he turns to this department for help.[6] It documents, computerises and handles all disputes whether they be territorial, military or juridical. It undertakes military, naval or air operations to preserve or restore international peace. It controls all atomic energy projects. But it is in its role as supervisor of all disarmament moves by member states that it would most affect the Falkland Islands if they were put in trusteeship. The Under Secretary-General would be the man in charge of disarming the Islands and getting rid of the British presence.

Coincidence?

Who then is the present holder of this important office? Viacheslav Ustinov. Curious, he sounds like a Russian. True, and a citizen of the USSR to boot. Surely, this is a one-off case? By no means. Here are the names of past holders from the beginning:

1946-1949	A Sobolev (USSR)
1949-1953	Konstantin E Zinchenko (USSR)
1953-1954	Ilya Tchernychev (USSR)
1954-1957	Dragoslav Protitch (Yugoslavia)
1958-1960	Anatoly Dobrynin (USSR)
1960-1962	Georgy P Arkadev (USSR)
1962-1963	E D Kiselev (USSR)
1963-1965	Vladimir P Suslov (USSR)
1965-1968	Alexei E Nesterenko (USSR)
1968-1973	Leonid N Kutakov (USSR)
1973-1978	Arkady N Shevchenko (USSR)
1978-1980	Mikhail D Sytenko (USSR)
1980-	Viacheslav Ustinov (USSR)

It is quite impossible to believe that coincidence accounts for thirteen holders of this office having been appointed from behind the Iron Curtain. Their appointments have been the result of deliberate policy from the very founding of the United Nations Organisation. How did this incredible arrangement come about? How could the Western Allies have allowed it to happen at all?

Trygve Lie, The first Secretary-General, himself nominated for the post by the Soviet Union, makes it perfectly clear that the entrusting of this sensitive UN post to the Soviets was agreed by the Big Five and tells us it was the Soviet delegate himself, Andrei Vyshinski, who was the first person to inform him. Mr Stettinus, the US Secretary of State, later confirmed that he had agreed with the Soviet delegation in the matter.[7] Arkady Shevchenko, listed above and the highest ranking of all Soviet political defectors, puts it this way: "By gentleman's agreement, the Secretary-General always accepts the candidate nominated by the Soviet Government."[8]

So there we have it: another of those vital post-war areas where Stalin won hands down. The real scandal has been the subsequent hushing up of these facts by successive American, British and Allied governments, by the international media, in fact by "world opinion".

Shevchenko's Testimony

The sensational defection to the West of Arkady Shevchenko in 1978 confirmed up to the hilt the dangers inherent in UN Trusteeship of the Falklands. On appointing him, Gromyko said, "Never forget, Shevchenko, you're a Soviet ambassador first, not an international bureaucrat."[9] Indeed, as Shevchenko admits, "Every Soviet national who takes the organisation's oath must commit perjury."[10] The fascination of Shevchenko's apologia lies in the conflict he describes between his training as a Soviet citizen and official and his gradual apprehension of Western ethical values. Though never a member of the KGB (of whom, incidentally, he was mortally afraid) he frankly confesses how he was compelled to be an active promoter of Soviet interests, to encroach upon the functions of other departments, to falsify reports[11], to widen the scope of Soviet ideology and propaganda warfare, to spy for the KGB and the GRU (Soviet military intelligence). We learn from him that the global scale of KGB operations is larger than the intelligence operations of all the Western nations combined.[12]

That the Soviet holders of this office of Under Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs are supremely well placed to subvert the UNO is now glaringly obvious. Lamentably, the weaknesses of the UN Charter are tailor-made for subversion. For instance, incredible as it may seem, the UN has never been able to agree on a definition of aggression. Attempts were made in vain in 1952, 1954 and 1957. Then, after seven years of quibbling, a fourth attempt was approved by the General Assembly in 1975. The result was a self-serving, totally meaningless definition empowering the Security Council to define aggression according to its ipse dixit and, worse still, to "undefine" aggressive acts when considered expedient.[13]

A likely scenario

Ironically, it could all end up with the Argentinian invasion of the Falklands being "undefined" as aggression, and Britain's defence of the Islands being condemned as aggression! It is into the hands of such as these that the policy of UN Trusteeship would commit our fellow Britons in the Falklands and snuff out their liberties, imperil the seaborne defence and trade capacities of the West, cut off our allies in Australasia and put to hazard our other South Atlantic territories and claims.

[1] **A Voyage Round The World**, Lord Anson, Everyman Library, 1942, p 92.
[2] **Hansard**, 15 June 1982, p 732. (continued on page 5)

CUT AND THRUST

by JANUS

A senior Anglican bishop in Kenya has denounced from his pulpit the police abuses, wrongful arrests, the national atmosphere of fear and the violations of human rights that increasingly characterise the running of that one-party dictatorship. It is a tyranny "worse than in South Africa," he claimed, which is perhaps why his protest received scant attention from the the British press. For his outspokenness, the bishop found himself harassed by police and some of his close church associates were picked up for interrogation. Tut! If he goes on like that, he stands no chance whatever of being made an Archbishop.

* * * *

The Office of Population Censuses and Surveys is a little behind with its figures, but not to worry. It is still enlightening to learn that in 1985 110,000 "British citizens" arrived to live here, the highest figure for over a decade. At the same time, 108,000 "Britons" left the country. Now can anybody explain to us the precise difference between a "British citizen" and a "Briton"? Can anyone also inform us how many additional entrants to these isles landed here without permission and thus were not recorded in the OPCS's statistics? For all our criticism of Kenya in the previous note, we cannot fault that territory's response to a similar problem. There, a crack-down has led to hundreds of illegal entrants being fined or jailed, and then deported, rather than being kept in five-star hotels or luxury liners while bleeding-hearted Members of Parliament argue vociferously on their behalf.

* * * *

We were glad to see the Japanese said no to voluntarily giving away their home market to Britain, not even supplying "our" masters with a face-saving formula with which to bamboozle the voters at the election. It was a particularly ill-chosen arena of battle, too, as the test-case selected was Cable and Wireless Ltd's participation in Japanese telecommunications. How could anyone claim the Japs need a foreign firm to supply or organise their home electrical set-up? Is our telephone system the envy of the Orient for efficiency, reliability and cheapness? If there is allegedly any spare British talent therein, we would have thought there was scope for it on the home front. If our telecom system were dramatically superior to all others, the world would beat a pathway to our door. Otherwise, they would be better advised to run their own show and keep their own profits. We, too!

* * * *

The news item in **The Times** read like a front-page exclusive in **Searchlight.** Police at Stourbridge received an anonymous tip-off that the Ku Klux Klan were holding a secret meeting in a secluded copse. Panda cars sped to the scene, ready to arrest and detain the offenders for plotting global race war. But instead of clandestine crimes against humanity the police found something rather less threatening. The sinister white-robed figures were members of the Hagley and Stourbridge Beekeepers' Association, dressed in protective white shrouds and gathered around eight bee hives. Some "anti-racist" in the Midlands must be suffering from a bee in his bonnet that's only too real!

SALVATION ARMY

HO, Ho, Ho, Democracy
And Parliamentary lunacy
When alien fraternity
Usurp national authority,
Allegedly, quite legally.

Indigenous community
Subordinate, so cleverly;
The 'host' becoming effigy
And strangers, with impunity,
Assume a gross supremity.

But somewhere there is sanity
And race and nationality
Find place again - Pacifically,
Albeit militarily -
To Fiji comes propriety!

B E BIGGS.

READ **OPEN SESAME**, an anthology of the poems of B E Biggs published in **Candour** during the past nineteen years. Only one pound from Candour Publishing Company.

FIJI FOR THE FIJIANS!

WE have not heard anyone suggest yet that we should offer to receive Fiji Indians over here, although we have heard it said their position may become "like the Ugandan Asians". So wait for it Australia and N.Z. - and us! It's amazing to think that till the coup the Fijian Fijians counted among the "goodies" of the world (being coloured), against whom it would be worse than a gaffe to breathe a word. Indeed, we used to be told how splendidly these Melanesians and Indians got on together - an example of racial harmony to us all. Now it's snarled over the radio that the Fijians own all the land and have the army in their hands. Well, they're only the original natives of the place! And they certainly wouldn't have been in that position if the colonial power hadn't seen to it. But that same colonial power shouldn't have let in, let alone brought in, the Indians. Anyway, let's hope the Fijians hang on to Fiji.

THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

IF capital punishment were made legal, it would be necessary to make murder illegal. So that is probably why it is not done.

FORTRESS FALKLANDS (continued from page 3)

[3] **Daily Telegraph**, 27 May 1986.
[4] **The Times**, 26 May 1986.
[5] **The United Nations Conspiracy**, Robert Lee, Western Islands, 1981.
[6] **The United Nations**, Louis Dolivet, Farrar Strauss & Co, 1946, p 29
[7] **In The Cause Of Peace**, Trygve Lie, Macmillan Co, 1954, pp 45-46.
[8] **Breaking With Moscow**, Arkady Shevchenko, Grafton Bks, 1986, p 355.
[9] ibid. p 356.
[10] ibid. p 360.
[11] **Daily Telegraph**, 24 November 1986, gives an example of this in the mysterious expunging from the UN Political Information Bulletin of an item of news reporting the use of poison gas by the Russians in Afghanistan.
[12] Shevchenko, op. cit. p 381.
[13] Lee, op. cit. p 49.

Miss Endean's article is available in the format of an illustrated and expanded eight-page pamphlet from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. No price is stated, but we estimate fifty pence would sufficiently cover the cost.

MR. THURLOW'S INCIPIENT CATARACT

AT least one of the press reviews of Richard Thurlow's new study of "Fascism" in Britain claims it will be the definitive work, as no-one would ever have the energy to plough through all Mr Thurlow's primary sources again. He certainly makes extensive use of security files from the 1930s and '40s, many only just released. So much so that the reader will be impressed by all he has to say about the 18b detainees, the failure of the Home Office to release "sensitive" files, the continuing secrecy and, alas, the continuing shame attaching to the detainees.

Mr Thurlow draws a contrast between the largely baseless treatment of the 18b detainees and that given to the Communists, who had been openly trying to sabotage the war effort until their volte-face when Russia was invaded. This lasted for a year. It is not only totally forgotten now, but those who pointed to the Communists' record then were branded for all time as "fascist traitors". 1,300 people were detained under Defence Regulation 18b, of whom only 750 were actually Fascists. Ironically, states the author, the Communist Party showed far more signs of being under foreign control. However, at another point he invites readers not to shed too many crocodile tears for the wartime fate of the British Fascists because they would have inflicted the same fate on the Jews had they held power. But what about those who were not Fascists? What about nearly half the detainees?

Being something of a political innocent, this writer had hoped for a clear definition of "Fascism" to serve as a limitation of Mr Thurlow's subject. It cannot be found. What is presented is a sort of history of people who called themselves "Fascist", and anyone who shared any of their ideas, and a general tendency to assume that being anti-semitic was the basic qualification. Thus, Captain Ramsay, the Conservative MP, is referred to as being on the "fascist fringe" of politics. Ben oreene, another detainee, was obsessed with the merits of the English Constitution, and how it ought to work without the intrusion of the Party System and the Whips. In Brixton, he was surrounded by Fascists and found their company and outlook intolerable, but he found real friendship and community of interest in Jock Ramsay and Admiral Sir Barry Domvile. This was without in any way sharing their personal hostility to Jews - if indeed they had any, because what they were really interested in was the way the power of finance had been manipulated to engineer the destruction of national interests.

The Strange Case Of Tyler Kent

Mr Thurlow should have discussed the Tyler Kent case without the benefit of hindsight. Whatever his motives, Kent had uncovered the most amazing security breach. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty and the principal war-monger against Germany (from the viewpoint of those who thought a war with Germany would be the greatest possible disaster to the world), was engaging in clandestine correspondence, unknown even to the Prime Minister then, much less his Cabinet colleagues, with the President of the United States who was campaigning for re-election on the basis that he would keep the USA out of the war. If it is really a fact that Roosevelt would not have been re-elected if the truth had been known, what price the democracy for which we were supposed to be fighting? If Churchill had really understood the depths of Roosevelt's deviousness and manipulation (he got quite a shock as the war progressed), would he have gone quite so blindly into such a criminal breach of security? Why were the security

services so blind to this one thing, while so anxious to clamp down on everything else?

Mr Thurlow presumes to include the League of Empire Loyalists in his "Fascist" net. When he says the LEL's "real pedigree was in little doubt", he speaks with the benefit of the hindsight of his own theme. Yes, indeed, the later "Fascist fringe" had their political baptism in the League - and either resigned or were chucked out! Mr Thurlow's summary of League members quite ignores a healthy contingent of British Israelites, Housewives Leaguers, Distributists, Social Crediters, True Tories and even libertarian Free Traders who could smell the rats lurking under the cover of the EEC. The Liverpool Branch had Orangemen and Catholics genuinely co-operating as they had never believed or expected to be able to. The League of Empire Loyalists was just that: it had four policy points and asked nothing more of its members than adherence to those.

He is honest enough not to blame the LEL for the growth of racialism in Britain. In fact, it campaigned against unrestricted immigration from the moment of its founding in the interests of preventing a racial problem arising. A K Chesterton's main point on immigration was the simple one that there was nowhere in the world where multi-racialism could be shown to have worked peacefully, except where British rule had provided a strong umbrella cover and barrier between the races. Whenever any part of the world was described as one in which the races were living harmoniously together, you could be sure that not long after the institution of "democracy" there would be a virulent racial problem. Fiji is but the latest example.

When Mr Thurlow says the League was half-way towards engaging itself in "fomenting civil disobedience", he is talking total nonsense, and when he adds "although not open terrorism" the implication is ugly and quite unjustified. To describe the League's political tactics as "old-fashioned" is exquisitely inept. They were original, serious but humorous; good-natured relations were maintained with many of the LEL's opponents. Candour, incidentally, was A K Chesterton's personal organ, not the "weekly of the LEL".

A final point: one of the difficulties Mr Thurlow has had is that he has used so much evidence and has chosen to regard some sources as "highly reliable" when we know they are not. Searchlight magazine, that "significant intelligence agency" in Mr Thurlow's words, is not reliable. One small example of how it gets its "facts" wrong will suffice. When Austen Brooks died recently, Searchlight maintained that he had kept up his old associations when working as a sub-editor on the Bournemouth Evening Echo after leaving the National Front in 1968. He did not. If Austen caught sight of any of his former friends, he crossed the road to avoid contact. So what right has Mr Thurlow to claim Searchlight knows "more about the extreme right [sic] than the fascists [sic] know themselves"?

Fascism in Britain by Richard Thurlow (Basil Blackwell), £16.00.

READ **TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY.** Elizabeth Freeman's 'commonplace book' that puts the materialism of the age in its true perspective, analyses the plan for world revolution and warns of the perils ahead. Be sure of your copy now. £10 UK, £12.50 elsewhere from CANDOUR PUBLISHING CO.

NATION STATE ON THE WAY OUT?

"SIR - Europe will not figure prominently in this election, but I suggest that in the longer run the Thatcher years will pave the way towards both a greater measure of European integration and also measures of regional devolution within the UK.

"On its own admission the Thatcher Government has neither the capacity nor the will to control market and financial forces, whereas a European government would have a greater capacity to pursue effective policies for employment, regional development and environmental protection. The Conservative Party has also, within an amazingly short period, lost both its imperial and its broader national roots and become very much a party of southern England... Its lack of respect for local government and the polarising effects of its policies are bound to produce disillusionment with the present political system over many parts of the country.

"A 'Europe of the regions' may at present seem visionary, but it would correspond well with emerging human needs. A European-wide government is becoming indispensable, not only for defence, but for economic and social policies which can match the international impact of finance and big business... [Concurrently] regional cultures are regaining their traditional appeal. Germany, Italy and Spain are all in various degrees regionalised, and regional assemblies for Scotland, Wales and perhaps North and South England would be equally natural developments.

"It is the nation state which is gradually becoming obsolete in Europe and, for all their nationalistic rhetoric, the actual policies of the Thatcherites will probably accelerate this process."

- Prof. Peter Self (Australian National University), **The Times**, 6/6/87.

At the risk of sounding visionary ourselves, we would draw readers' minds to what **Candour** had to say about "this separatist object" near enough ten years ago to the month. We wondered if the supposed desire for devolution had not a little to do with the fact that such movements "have the effect of weakening the authority of national governments while, concurrently, the drive to strengthen the centralisation of power in Brussels will do precisely the same thing... The end-product would serve very neatly to form an infra-structure of smaller administrative regions for a new federal European power-pyramid." Professor Self's letter is a timely reminder that the situation continues to need a very careful watch.

READ **THE REALIST**, New Zealand's bi-monthly journal for nationalists. For sample copies send a £1 postal order to Realist Publications, P.O. Box 38-262, Petone, Wellington, New Zealand.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. $10 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Candour needs more subscribers! Have YOU secured one yet?

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle)